

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-17 are pending in the application, with 1, 9, and 17 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 9 and 17 are sought to be amended. These changes introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Support for the amendment can be found in Figures 4-5 wherein the PMOS or NMOS transistor in the ESD protection system is always turned on and always conducts the incoming signal to the circuit.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because they fail to show "a resistor" as described in the specification. Figures 4 and 5 have been amended. Replacement sheets are filed herewith.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,522,511 ("John"). Claim 1 has been amended to state that the ESD protection system does not effect the logical function of the circuit. This feature is not disclosed by John. For at least this reason, therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by this reference.

In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 2-8 as being anticipated by John. These dependent claims necessarily include all features of claim 1 as amended. Because the above-referenced feature is now in claim 1, this feature is likewise present in claims 2-8. Given that this feature is not disclosed in John, this reference fails to disclose all features of each of claims 2-8. These claims are therefore not anticipated by this reference.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 9 as being anticipated by John. Claim 9 has also been amended to state that the ESD protection system does not effect the logical function of the circuit. Because this feature is not disclosed by John, claim 9 is not anticipated by this reference.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 10-16 on the basis of John. Claims 10-16, which depend from claim 9, now includes this feature as well. Given that this feature is not disclosed by John, claims 10-16 are likewise not anticipated by the reference.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 17 as being anticipated by John. Claim 17 has been amended in a manner similar to claims 1 and 9. Claim 17 now states that the ESD protection system does not effect the logical function of the circuit. Because this feature is not disclosed in John, claim 17, as amended, is not anticipated by this reference.


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward W. Yee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,294

Date: July 19, 2006

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600